

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

KENT A. BELT,

Defendant and Appellant.

E064855

(Super.Ct.No. FVI1102902)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. John M. Tomberlin, Judge. Affirmed.

Joshua L. Siegel, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant and appellant Kent A. Belt admitted to violating the terms and conditions of his probation by failing to complete his required domestic violence classes. Defendant's probation was thereafter revoked, and he was sentenced to the previously

suspended term of four years in state prison. Defendant appeals, based on the sentence or other matters occurring after the plea. We find no error and affirm the judgment.

I

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND¹

In December 2011, defendant and the victim were in an intimate dating relationship. On December 21, 2011, after defendant picked up the victim at her home, defendant accused her of cheating on him with his twin brother. Over the next few days while the two were traveling together in defendant's long-haul truck, defendant slapped, punched, and kicked the victim multiple times. He also told her that he was going to kill her and would not let the victim leave. The victim made several attempts to receive the help of others.

On December 24, 2011, police eventually made contact with the victim. The police noticed that the victim had two black eyes and a small cut above her right eye. Defendant admitted being angry with the victim because she had cheated on him but denied hitting her.

On December 27, 2011, a complaint was filed charging defendant with kidnapping (Pen. Code, § 207, subd. (a); count 1) and criminal threats (Pen. Code, § 422; count 2). The complaint further alleged that defendant had suffered a prior strike conviction (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subds. (b)-(i), 1170.12, subds. (a)-(d)).

¹ The factual background is taken from the probation officer's report.

On February 9, 2012, the People amended the complaint to add a charge of infliction of corporal injury on a cohabitant (Pen. Code, § 273.5, subd. (a); count 3). Defendant thereafter pled no contest to count 3. In return, the remaining allegations were dismissed, and defendant was placed on probation for the agreed upon term of four years on various terms and conditions, including serving 365 days in county jail.

On June 11, 2015, a petition was filed to revoke defendant's probation on several grounds. Specifically, the petition alleged that defendant failed to report to his probation officer, cooperate with his probation officer in a plan of rehabilitation, left the state without first obtaining written permission, failed to keep his probation officer informed of his place of residence, and failed to complete a domestic violence program.

On August 12, 2015, defendant admitted to violating his probation by failing to complete the required domestic violence program.

On October 27, 2015, the trial court revoked defendant's probation and sentenced defendant to the previously suspended term of four years in state prison with a credit of 585 days for time served. Defendant subsequently filed a timely notice of appeal based on the sentence or other matters occurring after the plea.

II

DISCUSSION

After defendant appealed, upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts and potential arguable issues, and requesting this court to conduct an independent review of the record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, and he has not done so.

Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the entire record for potential error and find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

III

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ

P. J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST

J.

SLOUGH

J.